MURPHY, GARY-July 30, 2007

Defendants' Objections

Pg. 56:14-20 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial; Involves settlement of a claim.	Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Settlement of a claim.	Pg. 56:14-20		FRE 401;402;403;408
Pg. 57:20-58:3 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial; Involves settlement of a claim. FRE 401;402;403;408			
relevant. Unduly prejudicial; Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 61:12-21 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial; Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 62:8-14 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 64:3-8 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 65:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Lack of foundation. Hearsay Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 401; 402; 403 FRE 602; 701; 702; 801			
Settlement of a claim. Pg. 61:12-21 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial; Involves settlement of a claim.	Pg. 57:20-58:3		FRE 401;402;403;408
Pg. 61:12-21 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial; Involves settlement of a claim.			
relevant. Unduly prejudicial; Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 62:8-14 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 64:3-8 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 65:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Settlement of a claim.	Pg. 61:12-21	I =	FRE 401;402;403;408
Pg. 62:8-14 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 64:3-8 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 65:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408; 602; 701; 702 FRE 403; 408 FRE 403; 408		, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 64:3-8 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 65:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Lack of foundation. Hearsay Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	7 (0 0 1	The state of the s	
Pg. 64:3-8 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 65:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	Pg. 62:8-14	,	1
Pg. 64:3-8 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 65:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.			702
relevant. Lack of foundation. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 65:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Lack of foundation. Hearsay FRE 602; 801 Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	D (100		
Pg. 65:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Lack of foundation. Hearsay Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	Pg. 64:3-8		1
Pg. 85:1-4 Involves litigation in other watershed – not relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Lack of foundation. Hearsay Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	702
relevant. Unduly prejudicial. Involves settlement of a claim. Pg. 85:1-86:24 Lack of foundation. Hearsay FRE 602; 801 Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion.	Dr. 65.1.4	A Court Cour	
Pg. 85:1-86:24 Lack of foundation. Hearsay FRE 602; 801 Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801	Pg. 65:1-4		FRE 403; 408
Pg. 85:1-86:24 Lack of foundation. Hearsay FRE 602; 801 Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion.			
Pg. 93:7-9 Not relevant – Tulsa case does not involve the IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	Da 95.1 96.24		FDF (02, 001
IRW. Probative value substantially outweighed by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 701; 702.	T		
by potential prejudice. Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 701; 702. FRE 701; 702.	rg. 93:7-9		FRE 401; 402; 403
Pg. 105:14-19 Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 701; 702.			·
Mischaracterizes prior testimony Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 701; 702; 801 FRE 701; 702, expert opinion.	Pc 105.14 10	<u> </u>	
Pg. 208:14-25 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 701; 702, expert opinion.	rg. 103.14-19		
Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 701; 702.	Pg 208:14 25		EDE 602, 701, 702, 901
Pg. 209:13-210:16 Lack of foundation. Calls for expert opinion. Hearsay Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 602; 701; 702; 801 FRE 701; 702.	1 g. 200.14-25		FRE 602; 701; 702; 801
Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	Ρα 200:13-210:16	<u> </u>	EDE 602, 701, 702, 901
Pg. 219:6-10 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	1 g. 207.13-210.10		FRE 602; 701; 702; 801
Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	Pg 219-6-10		
Pg. 219:17-24 Assumes facts not in evidence; misstates prior testimony Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	5.217.010	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,
Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.	Pg. 219:17-24		
Pg. 228:5-14 Asked and answered; argumentative. Calls for expert opinion. FRE 701; 702.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
expert opinion.	Pg. 228:5-14		FRE 701: 702
	<i>J.</i> ==	,	101, 102.
Pg. 236:6-238:3 Lack of foundation: calls for expert opinions FRE 701 702	Pg. 236:6-238:3	Lack of foundation; calls for expert opinions.	FRE 701, 702.

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
None		

PARRISH, DANIEL January 14, 2008

Start	Stop	Objection	Authority
Pg. 14, 11. 9	Pg. 14, ll. 15	Answer is	
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative	
Pg. 18, 11. 24	Pg. 19, ll. 6	Answer is	
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative	
Pg. 84, 11. 10	Pg. 84, 11. 20	Answer is unsolicited,	
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative	
Pg. 152, Il. 5	Pg. 153, 11. 2	Answer is	
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative	
Pg. 199, ll. 16	Pg. 199, 11. 23	Answer is	FRE 403
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative;	
		cumulative	
Pg. 212, 1l. 22	Pg. 212, Il. 25	Answer is	FRE 403
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative;	
		cumulative	
Pg. 213, ll. 4	Pg. 213, Il. 11	Answer is	FRE 403
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative;	
		cumulative	
Pg. 253, ll. 11	Pg. 253, ll. 11	Question to which	FRE 403
		objection belongs is	0
		not designated by	
		either party	
Pg. 258, ll. 15	Pg. 258, 1l. 21	Answer is	FRE 403
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative;	
		cumulative	
Pg. 259, ll. 15	Pg. 259, ll. 16	Answer is	FRE 403
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative;	
		cumulative	
Pg. 259, Il. 19	Pg. 259, Il. 25	Answer is	FRE 403
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative;	
		cumulative	
Pg. 274, 11. 21	Pg. 276, ll. 11	Lack of foundation;	FRE 602

		compound question;	FRE 611
		assumes facts not in	
		evidence; leading	
Pg. 276, ll. 23	Pg. 277, 11. 3	Lack of foundation;	FRE 402
20. 21. 0, 11. 22	2 8 27 7 9 22 7	assumes facts not in	FRE 403
		l .	FRE 602
1.0		evidence; misleads	FRE 002
		jury; lack or	
	a diameter	relevance; cumulative;	
		question is vague and	
		ambiguous	
Pg. 278, 11. 22	Pg. 279, 11. 5	Lack of foundation;	FRE 402
		compound question;	FRE 602
		assumes facts not in	FRE 611
		eyidence; leading;	FRE 802
		question is vague and	110002
		ambiguous; lack of	
		personal knowledge;	
·		hearsay; lack of	.*
		relevance; calls for	
		speculation	
Pg. 284, 11. 2	Pg. 285, 1l. 13	Lack of foundation;	FRE 602
		lack of personal	FRE 611
		knowledge; assumes	FRE 702/703
		facts not in evidence;	FRE 802
	•	calls for speculation;	110002
		answer is	
		nonresponsive and	
		argumentative;	
		question is vague and	
		ambiguous;	
		argumentative;	
		leading; hearsay;	
	•	witness not qualified	
·	r	as expert on this topic	
Pg. 287, 11. 22	Pg. 288, ll. 17	Lack of foundation;	FRE 602
15. 201, 11. 22	1 5. 400, 11. 17	lack of personal	FRE 611
		- 1	
	e la companya di salah sal	knowledge; assumes	FRE 702/703
		facts not in evidence;	
,		calls for speculation;	
		answer is	
		nonresponsive and	
·		argumentative;	•
		question is vague and	
·		ambiguous;	
		argumentative;	
		leading; witness not	

	qualified as expert on this topic	

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
10:15-24	Assumes facts, vague and compound	
116:23 – 117:10	Relevance, confusion, misleading the	FRE 401 and 403
	jury	
202:20-25	Relevance	FRE 401 and 403
202:2 - 205:5	Relevance	FRE 401 and 403
226:10 -23	Opinion of lay witness; lack of	FRE 602, 701, 802
	foundation; hearsay	
248:2-20	Lack of personal knowledge as to	FRE 602
	"anyone"	
252:23-253:2	Relevance, foundation and lay	FRE 401, 403, 602 and
	opinion	701
253:14-22	Relevance; foundation and lay	FRE 401, 403, 602 and
	opinion	701

PARROTT, CARL – May 30, 2008

Defendants' Objections

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Pg. 221, II. 1 - 8	Answer is non-responsive	
Pg. 292, II. 23 - 24	Answer is nonresponsive and argumentative; lack of personal knowledge; answer is based upon speculation	FRE 602
Pg. 294, II. 23 - Pg. 295, II. 16	Argumentative; lack of foundation	

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Pg. 40, II. 6 - 19	Calls for	Rule 602
	speculation	
Pg. 63, Il. 23 - Pg. 64, Il. 3	Assumes facts not in	
	evidence	
Pg. 74, II. 23 - Pg. 75, II. 5	Calls for	Rule 602
	speculation	
Pg. 75, II. 20 - 24	Calls for	Rule 602
	speculation	
Pg. 79, II. 24 - 25	Leading, and Relevance	Rule 402 and 403
		Rule 611(c)
Pg. 98, II. 18 - 20	Calls for	Rule 602
	speculation	
Pg. 108, II. 14 - 16	Calls for	Rule 602
	speculation and Witness is	Rule 701
5 440 !! 44	not an expert	
Pg. 112, II. 11 - 13	Assumes facts not in	
D 440 II 45 47	evidence	
Pg. 112, II. 15 - 17	Assumes facts not in	
D- 445 II 04 D- 440	evidence	D 1 400 1 400
Pg. 145, II. 24 - Pg. 146,	Relevance, Asked and	Rule 402 and 403
II., 2	Answered, Calls for a legal conclusion	Rule 611(a)
De 452 II 4 5		Rule 701
Pg. 153, II. 4 - 5	Relevance	Rule 402 and 403
Pg. 153, II. 7	Relevance	Rule 402 and 403
Pg. 158, II. 20 - 24	Relevance	Rule 402 and 403
Pg. 227, II. 9 - 10	Relevance	Rule 402 & 403
Pg. 244, II. 15 - 16	Calls for an	Rule 701
	expert opinion	i

PATRICK, STEVEN - August 21, 2007

Start	Stop	Objection
Pg.66, ll. 4.	Pg. 66, 11. 20.	Objection: Vague and misleading.
Pg. 73, 11. 1.	Pg. 73, 11. 4.	Objection: Calls for speculation. Lack of Foundation
Pg. 73, ll. 6.	Pg. 73, 11. 12.	Objection: Calls for speculation; Lack of Foundation.
Pg. 92, 11. 5.	Pg. 92, 11. 21.	Objection: Calls for legal conclusion.
Pg. 94, ll. 10.	Pg. 94, 11. 19.	Objection: Lack of Foundation. Misleading and mischaracterizes task force.
Pg. 97, Il. 14.	Pg. 103, II. 22.	Objection: Outside scope of 30(b)(6). Hearsay. Lack of Foundation. Irrelevant under Rule 401 or in alternative not admissible under Rule 403. Violates order of the Court on testimony and evidence from City of Tulsa case.
Pg. 102, ll. 3.	Pg. 103, 11. 3.	Objection: Misleading and mischaracterizes testimony. Lack of foundation. Assumes facts not in evidence.
Pg. 126, ll.16.	Pg. 127, ll. 6.	Objection: Mischaracterizes testimony. Lack of foundation. Calls for legal conclusion. Misleading.
Pg. 129, ll. 8.	Pg. 129, 11. 24.	Objection: Reference to "Tyson's use" is misleading
Pg. 129, ll. 25.	Pg. 130, ll. 9.	Objection: Misleading
Pg. 178, ll. 19.	Pg. 178, ll. 22.	Objection: Misleading
Pg. 236, ll. 16.	Pg. 237, 11. 18.	Objection: Hearsay. Lack of Foundation. Calls for speculation.

PHILLIPS, SHANON 1/17/2008

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Pg. 17, II. 13 - 20	Misleading to jury; lack	FRE 402
	of relevance; lack of	
	foundation	
Pg. 52, II. 18 - 22	Answer is	
	nonresponsive and	
	argumentative	
Pg. 58, II. 20 - Pg. 59, II.	Leading; calls for	FRE 403
14.	speculation; calls for	FRE 602
	legal conclusion; answer	FRE 611
	is nonresponsive and	FRE 702/703
	argumentative; unfairly	
	prejudicial; assumes	
	facts not in evidence;	
	witness not qualified as	
	expert on this topic	
Pg. 82, Il. 10 - Pg. 84, Il.	Answer is	FRE 602
6	nonresponsive and	FRE 702/703
	argumentative; lack of	
	personal knowledge;	
	witness not qualified as	
	expert on this topic	
Pg. 128, Il. 4 - 16	Lack of foundation; lack	FRE 602
	of personal knowledge;	FRE 702/703
	calls for speculation;	
	assumes facts not in	
	evidence; witness not	
	qualified as expert on	
D 400 H # 40	this topic	EDE COO
Pg. 129, Il. 5 - 12	Argumentative; lack of	FRE 602
	foundation; calls for	
	speculation; lack of	
	personal knowledge;	
Dr. 120 II 12 22	misleading to jury	FRE 602
Pg. 129, II. 13 - 23	Lack of foundation; calls	FRE 702/703
	for speculation; assumes facts not in	TINE /UZ//U3
	evidence; witness not	
	qualified as expert on	
	this topic	
Pg. 130, II. 6 - 11	Lack of foundation; lack	FRE 602
rg. 130, II. 0 - 11	of personal knowledge;	FRE 702/703
	calls for speculation;	1111 /02//03
	cans for speculation,	

	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	assumes facts not in	
	evidence; witness not	
	qualified as expert on	
	this topic	
Pg. 130, II. 12 - Pg. 131,	Lack of foundation; lack	FRE 602, 702/703
II. 2	of personal knowledge;	
	calls for speculation;	
	assumes facts not in	
	evidence; witness not	
	qualified as expert on	i ·
	this topic; compound	
	question	
Pg. 131, II. 16 - 25	Lack of foundation; lack	FRE 602, 802
	of personal knowledge;	FRCP 30(b)(6)
	witness not designated	
	as 30(b)(6)	
	representative; answer	
	is nonresponsive;	
	hearsay	
Pg. 132, Il. 5 - 21	Lack of foundation;	FRE 602
	question is vague and	FRE 702/703
	ambiguous; lack of	
	personal knowledge;	·
	calls for speculation;	
	witness not qualified as	
	expert on this topic	
Pg. 141, II. 14 - 19	Seeks legal conclusion;	FRE 602
	lack of foundation;	FRE 702/703
	answer is nonresponsive	FRE 704
	and argumentative;	
	expert not qualified as	
	expert on this topic; lack	
	of personal knowledge;	
	misleading to jury	·
	- · ·	

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Pg. 84, II. 7-11; 13-17;	Relevance.	Rule 402 and 403
20-22.		
Pg. 91, II. 6-8; 10-11.	Relevance	Rule 402 and 403
Pg. 137, II. 12 - 16	Calls for a Legal	
	Conclusion	

PEACH, TERRY - April 10, 2009

Defendants' Objections - NONE

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority		
P6L5-P7L15	Relevance	Rule 401		
P 21 L 2-3, 13-25	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403		
	and Confusing; Calls for	i ,		
	a legal conclusion			
P 22 L 1-16	Relevance; Misleading Rule 401, Rule 403			
	and Confusing; Calls for			
	a legal conclusion			
P 28 L 7 - P 29 L 1	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403		
v	and Confusing; Calls for			
	a legal conclusion			
P 29 L 13-17	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403		
	and Confusing; Calls for			
	a legal conclusion			
P 37 L 8 - P 38 L 8	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
	and Confusing; Calls for	602		
	a legal conclusion; Lack			
	of personal knowledge			
P39L5-P40L22	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403		
	and Confusing; Calls for			
	a legal conclusion; Calls			
	for speculation			
P 42 L 1 - P 43 L 1	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403		
·	and Confusing; Calls for			
	a legal conclusion; Calls			
	for speculation			
P 49 L 2-8	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
	and Confusing; Calls for 602, Rule 701			
	a legal conclusion; Lack			
	of personal knowledge;			
	Misrepresents previous			
	testimony; Opinion of			
D 5 2 1 4 2 4	lay witness			
P 53 L 4-24	Lack of foundation; Lack Rule 602			
DEGLO DEGLO	of personal knowledge			
P 58 L 8 - P 59 L 1	Relevance; Misleading Rule 401, Rule 403, Ru			
	and Confusing; Calls for 602			
	a legal conclusion; Lack			
	of personal knowledge;			
	Misrepresents previous			
	testimony			

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	and Confusing; Lack of	602, Rule 701
	personal knowledge;	
	Opinion of lay witness	
P 81 L 4-9	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
	and Confusing; Lack of	602, Rule 701
	personal knowledge;	,
	Opinion of lay witness;	
	Calls for speculation	
P 81 L 17-25	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
	and Confusing; Lack of	602, Rule 701
	personal knowledge;	
	Opinion of lay witness;	
	Calls for speculation	
P 82 L 1-19	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
	and Confusing; Lack of	602, Rule 701
-	personal knowledge;	002) Naic 701
	1 ,	
·	Opinion of lay witness;	
	Calls for speculation	D 1 404 D 1 400 D 1
P 85 L 12-25	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
	and Confusing; Calls for	602, Rule 701
	a legal conclusion; Lack	
	of personal knowledge;	
	Opinion of lay witness	
P 86 L 1-4	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
	and Confusing; Calls for	602, Rule 701
	a legal conclusion; Lack	
	of personal knowledge;	
·	Opinion of lay witness	
DOC 1 25 DOZ 1 25		Dula 401 Bula 402
P 86 L 25 – P 87 L 25	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403
	and Confusing	
P 88 L 1-24	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403
	and Confusing	
P 89 L 1-25	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
	and Confusing; Calls for	602, Rule 701
	a legal conclusion; Lack	
	of personal knowledge;	
	Opinion of lay witness	
P 90 L 2	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
	and Confusing; Lack of	602
		002
	personal knowledge	D. I. 404 D. I. 403
P 91 L 7 -24	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403
	and Confusing; Calls for	
	a legal conclusion	
P 92 L 1, 7-9, 11-14,	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403
16-25	and Confusing; Calls for	
	a legal conclusion	
P 93 L 1-4, 6-13, 15-25	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
: JJ L 1.7, U-1J, 1J-2J	Morevaries, wildicading	maio 101, haic 400, haic

	Opinion of lay witness;			
	Assumes facts in dispute			
	and not in evidence			
P 131 18 -25	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
	and Confusing; Lack of	602		
	personal knowledge;			
	Calls for speculation;			
	Assumes facts in dispute	,		
	and not in evidence			
P 132 L 1-6	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403		
	and Confusing; Calls for			
	a legal conclusion	B 1 404 B 1 400		
P 132 L 24 – P 133 L 1	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403		
	and Confusing; Calls for			
D42C144 D42715	a legal conclusion	Pulo 401 Pulo 701		
P 136 L 11 – P 137 L 5	Relevance; Opinion of	Rule 401, Rule 701		
P 137 L 18-25	lay witness Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
P 157 L 10-25	and Confusing; Lack of	602, Rule 701		
	foundation; Lack of	002, Nuie 701		
	personal knowledge;			
	Calls for speculation;			
	Opinion of lay witness;			
	Assumes facts not in	·		
	evidence			
P 183 L 1-12	Relevance	Rule 401		
P 138 L 22 – P 140 L 4	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
	and Confusing; Calls for 602			
	a legal conclusion; Lack			
	of personal knowledge			
P 140 L 6-23	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
	and Confusing; Calls for	602		
	a legal conclusion; Lack			
	of personal knowledge	D. I. 404 D. I. 402 D. I.		
P 141 L 1-6	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
	and Confusing; Calls for	602		
	a legal conclusion; Lack			
L. C.	of personal knowledge	Pula 404 Pula 403 Pul		
P 141 L 17-25	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
	and Confusing; Calls for	602		
	a legal conclusion; Lack			
24421442	of personal knowledge	Dulo 401 Dulo 402 Dulo		
P 142 L 1-12	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule		
	and Confusing; Calls for	602		
	a legal conclusion; Lack			
	of personal knowledge			

<u></u>		
P 143 L 1-17	Relevance; Misleading	Rule 401, Rule 403, Rule
	and Confusing; Calls for	701
	speculation; Opinion of	
	lay witness; Assumes	
	facts in dispute and not	
	in evidence	

PULLIAM, LESSLEY -- March 11, 2009

Defendants' Objections

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Pg. 16, II. 10 - 11	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 16, II. 13	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 16, II. 15 - 16	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 16, II. 18 - 20	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 16, II. 22	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 16, II. 24 - 25	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 21, II. 3 - 5	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 21, II. 7 - 8	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 21, II. 15 - 16	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 21, II. 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 21, II. 20 - 23	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 21, II. 25 - Pg. 22, II.	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
2		
Pg. 22, II. 6 - 7	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 22, Il. 9 - 10	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 22, II.12 - 13	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 22, II. 15 - 16	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 22, II. 18 - 19	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 22, II. 21 - 23	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 22, II. 25 - Pg. 23, II.	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
1		
Pg. 23, II. 4 - 5	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 23, II. 7 - 8	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 23, II. 10 - 11	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 23, Il. 13 - 14	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 23, II. 16 - 17	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 23, II. 20	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 23, II. 22 - 24	Relevance	Rule 401, 402
Pg. 25, II. 19 - 20	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 25, II. 22 - 23	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 26, II. 1 - 2	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 26, II. 4 - 5	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 26, II. 7 - 12	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 26, Il. 14 - 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 26, II. 20 - 22	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 27, II. 19 - 20	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 27, II. 22 - 25	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 29, II. 18 - 19	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 31, II. 24 - 25	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403

Pg. 32, Il. 2 - 3	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 32, II. 5	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 32, II. 8 - 9	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 32, II. 11	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 32, II. 13	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 32, II. 15	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 32, II. 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 32, II. 20 - 21	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 32, II. 23	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 33, Il. 1 - 3	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 33, II. 7 - 8	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 33, Il. 11 - 13	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 33, II. 16 - 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 33, II. 21 - 23	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 34, II. 1	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 36, II. 6 - 8	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 36, II. 12 - 13	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 36, II. 15 - 16	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 36, II. 19 - 20	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 36, II. 22 - 24	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 37, II. 12 - 14	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 37, II. 16	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 37, II. 20 - 23	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 38, II. 1 - 3	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 38, II. 5 - 6	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 39, II. 14 - 16	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 39, II. 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 39, II. 20 Pg. 39, II. 23		Rule 401, 402, 403
	Relevance Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 40, II. 1	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 40, II. 3 - 5		Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 40, II. 8 - 9	Relevance	
Pg. 40, II. 11 - 12	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 40, II. 14 - 16	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 40, II. 18 - 19	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 40, II. 21	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 40, II. 24 - 25	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 41, II. 2 - 3	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 41, II. 5 - 6	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 41, II. 8 - 9	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 41, II. 12 - 13	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 41, II. 15 - 16	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 41, II. 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 41, II. 23	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 41, II. 25 - Pg. 42, II.	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
2		<u> </u>

Pg. 42, II. 5 - 8	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 42, II. 11 - 12	Relevance Rule 401, 402, 403	
Pg. 45, II. 20 - Pg. 46, II.	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
4 45, II. 20 - Fg. 40, II.	Kelevalice	Naic 401, 402, 403
Pg. 46, II. 5 - 8	Relevance Rule 401, 402, 403	
Pg. 46, II. 12 - 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 46, II. 22 - 25	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 47, II. 2 - 3	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 47, II. 5 - 6	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 47, II. 8 - 11	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 47, II. 13	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
3,5	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 47, II. 15 - 21	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
,	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 47, II. 24 - Pg. 48, II.	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
7	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 48, II. 9 - 11	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 48, II. 13 - 14	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 48, II. 16 - 17	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 48, II. 19 - 20	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
. ,	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 48, II. 22 - 25	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 49, II. 2 - 5	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 49, II. 9 - 10	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 49, II. 13 - 22	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 49, II. 24 - Pg. 50, II.	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
1	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 50, II. 5 - 8	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 50, II. 9 - 10	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge	Rule 602
Pg. 53, II. 19 - 22	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 54, II. 8 - 9	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 54, II. 13 - 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 54, II. 20 - 21	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 54, II. 25 - Pg. 55, II.	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
1		
Pg. 55, II. 3 - 4	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 55, II. 6 - 8	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 55, II. 10 - 12	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403

Pg. 76, II. 3	Relevance Rule 401, 402, 403	
Pg. 76, II. 7 - 10	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 76, II. 12 - 13	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 76, II. 15 - 20	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 77, Il. 1	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 77, II. 3 - 5	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 77, II. 7 - 8	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 77, II. 11	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 77, II. 14	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 77, II. 17 - 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 77, II. 20	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 77, II. 23 - 24	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 84, II. 5 - 9	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge;	Rule 602
	Opinion of lay witness	Rule 701
Pg. 88, II. 2 - 4	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge;	Rule 602
		Rule 701
Pg. 88, II. 6 - 8	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge;	Rule 602
		Rule 701
Pg. 88, II. 10 - 11	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge;	Rule 602
		Rule 701
Pg. 88, II. 16 - 18	Relevance; Lack of	Rule 401, 402, 403
	personal knowledge;	Rule 602
		Rule 701
Pg. 90, II. 4 - 9	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 90, Il. 11 - 12	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 97, II. 17 - 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 98, II. 3	Relevance Rule 401, 402, 403	
Pg. 98, II. 6 - 7	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 98, Il. 10 - 11	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 98, II. 17 - 18	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403
Pg. 98, II. 20 - 21	Relevance	Rule 401, 402, 403

SCHAFFER, ARCHIE --July 9, 2008

Defendants' Objections

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority		
19:3 - 20:4	Lack of Foundation Rule 602			
20:25 - 21:9	Lack of Foundation,	Rules 403, 602		
	Misleading			
21:10 - 21:23	Relevance; Probative Value	Rules 401, 403		
	outweighed by unfair			
	prejudice, confusion.			
65:2 - 82:2	Def's objection - to all	Rules 401, 403		
	testimony regarding Ex. 7			
	(thru p. 82:2); Document			
	is from production in City of			
	Tulsa case, and not relevant			
	to this case. Subject to MIL			
	on same issue.			
103:2 - 111:16	Def's objection - to all	Rules 401, 403		
	testimony regarding Ex. 8			
	(thru p. 82:2); Document			
	is from production in City of			
	Tulsa case, and not relevant			
	to this case. Subject to MIL			
	on same issue. Probative			
	value outweighed by			
	prejudice and confusion of			
	the issues.			

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
None		

Defendants' Objections - None

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
53:14 – 54:19	Lacks Foundation, Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403, 602
55:6 - 15	Lacks Foundation, Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403,
		602
58:1 - 6	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
96:19 - 99:24	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
103:8 - 105:15	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
107:21 - 108:3	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
111:2 – 19	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
112:23 – 113:11	Relevance; Calls for	Rules 401, 402, 403.
	Speculation	
115:6 - 13	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
115:21 - 117:23	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
119:2 - 25	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
122:17 – 25	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
124:4 - 127:7	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
128:24 - 129:2	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
129:25 - 130:6	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
130:15 - 131:13	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
133:23 - 138:1	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
139:10 - 140:5	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
140:15 - 147:24	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
150:2 – 11	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
151:9 – 18	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
152:13 – 154:18	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
155:5 – 158:2	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
158:12 - 159:20	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.
161:3 – 163:20	Relevance	Rules 401, 402, 403.

SIMMONS, MARK – June 17, 2008

Start	Stop	Objection
Pg. 28, Il. 13.	Pg. 29, II. 1	Assumes facts not in evidence. lack of foundation
·		701, 602
Pg. 33, II. 6.	Pg. 33, Il. 17.	Lack of foundation. 701, 602. Hearsay 801
Pg. 33, Il. 22.	Pg. 34, II. 11.	Lack of foundation. 701, 702
Pg. 34, Il. 24.	Pg. 35, Il. 6.	Lack of foundation. 701, 702. Hearsay 801
Pg. 35, Il. 11.	Pg. 35, Il. 14.	Lack of foundation. 701, 702. Hearsay 801
Pg. 36, Il. 5.	Pg. 36, II. 10.	Lack of foundation. 602
Pg. 36, Il. 11	Pg. 36, Il. 21	Lack of foundation. 602. Hearsay 801
Pg. 38, II. 3.	Pg. 38, II. 15.	Lack of foundation. 701, 702. Hearsay 801
Pg. 49, II. 25.	Pg. 50, II. 4.	Not relevant 401, 402. Hearsay 801
Pg. 66, II. 18.	Pg. 66, Il. 19.	Mr. Bullock's testimony improper
Pg. 80, II. 9.	Pg. 82, II. 10.	Not relevant. Concerns settlement terms of Eucha-
		Spavinaw case. 401, 402, 408. Also unduly
		prejudicial. 403
Pg. 82, II. 23.	Pg. 83, II. 3.	Not relevant. Concerns settlement terms of Eucha
		Spavinaw case. 401, 402, 408. Also unduly
		prejudicial. 403.
Pg. 84, II. 6.	Pg. 84, II. 11.	Not relevant. Concerns settlement terms of Eucha
		Spavinaw case. 401, 402, 408. Also unduly
		prejudicial. 403.
Pg. 85, II. 20.	Pg. 86, II. 20.	Lack of foundation. 701, 702. Hearsay 801
Pg. 92, II. 7.	Pg. 93, II. 12.	Lack of foundation. 701. 702.
Pg. 112, Il. 13.	Pg. 113, II. 4.	Lack of foundation. 602. Hearsay 801
Pg. 113, ll. 11	Pg. 113, II. 15	Lack of foundation. 602. Hearsay 801
Pg. 113, Il. 22.	Pg. 114, II. 10.	Lack of foundation. 602. Hearsay 801
Pg. 120, II. 7.	Pg. 120, II. 24	Lack of foundation. 602, 701, 702. Hearsay 801.
Pg. 123, Il. 2.	Pg. 124, ll. 15.	Lack of foundation. 602, 701, 702. Hearsay 801.
Pg. 125, Il. 24.	Pg. 127, II. 16.	Lack of foundation. 601, 701, 702. Hearsay 801.
Pg. 128, II. 15.	Pg. 128, II. 22.	Mischaracterizes testimony; assumes facts not in
		evidence; lack of foundation

SMITH, DUANE - April 13, 2009

Defendants' Objections: None

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Page 72 L 1 to 8	Form & Relevance	FRE 402
Page 73 L 16 to 22	Form & Relevance	FRE 402
Page 85 L 15 to 25	Relevance & Unfair	FRE 402 & 403
	Prejudice	
Page 86 L 1 to	Relevance & Unfair	FRE 402 & 403
Page 89 L 11	Prejudice	
Page 95 L 25 to	Objection Withdrawn	
Page 96 L 9		
Page 96 L13 to 19	Objection Withdrawn	
Page 96 L 20 to	Relevance & Unfair	FRE 402 & 403
Page 97 L5	Prejudice	
Page 97 L 6 to 18	Objection Withdrawn	
Page 98 L 3 to 7	Objection Withdrawn	14
Page 98 L 8 to 18	Relevance & Unfair	FRE 402 & 403
	Prejudice	
Page 100 L 20 to 23	Agreed to Withdraw	FRE 402, 403 & 602
	Designation	
Page 100 L 24 to	Relevance, Unfair	FRE 402, 403 & 602
Page 101 L 4	Prejudice & Lack of	
	Personal Knowledge	
Page 101 L 5 to 9	Relevance, Unfair	FRE 402, 403, 602 & 802
	Prejudice, Lack of	
	Personal Knowledge &	
	Hearsay	
Page 101 L10 to 19	Relevance & Unfair	FRE 402 & 403
Dago 103 L 1 to 15	Prejudice	FDF 402 8 402
Page 102 L 1 to 15	Relevance & Unfair	FRE 402 & 403
Page 116 L 2 to 23	Prejudice Form (cumulative &	EDE 103 103 9, 603
Lage 110 L 2 (0 23	asked and answered),	FRE 402, 403 & 602
	Relevance , Unfair Prejudice and Lack of	
	Personal Knowledge	
Page 117 L 2 to 20	Form (cumulative &	FRE 402, 403 & 602
	asked and answered),	THE 702, 700 & 002
	Relevance, Unfair	
	Prejudice & Lack of	
	Personal Knowledge	
	. c.sonar anovicage	

SMITHEE, DEREK

Plaintiffs' Objections

Objections as to Form of Question

23:8-10	Speculation; Calls for a legal conclusion
24:7-10	Speculation; Calls for a legal conclusion
171:22-23	Asked and answered
180:16-18	Speculation

OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANTS' DESIGNATIONS

14:4-5; 13-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
15:1-16	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
16:4-15; 23-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
17:1-8; 14-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
18:1-3; 14-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
19:1-2; 9-13, 20-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
	F.R.E. 701 – Opinion of Lay Witness (not based on specialized
	knowledge)
20:15-16	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge; Lack of foundation
21:20-23:5	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
23:11 - 24:6	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
24:11-16, 24:21-25:2	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
29:5-20	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
30:4-8	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
32:18-24	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
33:2-20; 24	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
36:12 - 37:2	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
42:10-17, 22-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
and 43:1-3, 6-8	and F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
45:2-5, 16-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
and 46:1-4	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
53:5-12, 15-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
and 54:9-25	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
59:16 – 60:6	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
79:18-19	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
80:14-23	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
and 81:4 – 82:10	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
82:14-24	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues

	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
83:13 - 84:4	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
84:9 – 85:18	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
86:6-14, 22-25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
and 87:1	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
88:24 - 89:9	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
93:2-14	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
103:14 - 104:5	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
104:14 - 105:22	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
106:5-9	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
114:6 - 115:6	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 - Lack of Personal Knowledge
115:15 – 116:2	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
•	
151:19 - 152:2	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
152:12-14	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
153:8-17	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
154:7-9	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
167:5-8, 12-22	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
170:15-19	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
172:3-13	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
172:18-24	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
172:25 - 174:20	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
176:4-10, 17-18,	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
and 22-24	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
177:5-16	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
4-0.44.46.0-	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
178:11-16, 25	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
450440445	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
179:1-4, 8, 14-15	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
and 19-25	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge
180:1-8, 13-24	F.R.E. 401, 402, 403 – General relevance; confusion of the issues
	F.R.E. 602 – Lack of Personal Knowledge

STORM, STEVE -- October 8, 2007

Defendants' Objections: None

Plaintiffs' Objections:

Steve Storm, Volume One:

Start	Stop	Objection	Authority
Pg. 62, 11. 4	Pg. 62, 11. 16	Mis-states contract	Form, 402, 403
		provision,	
		Ambiguous,	
		Irrelevant	
Pg. 64, 11. 8	Pg. 64, 11. 12	Mis-states contract	Form, 402, 403
		provision,	
	*	Ambiguous,	
		Irrelevant	
Pg. 77, 11. 25	Pg. 78, 11. 2	Mis-states prior	Form, 602
		testimony	
Pg. 79, 11. 21	Pg. 79, 11. 22	Ambiguous, No	Form, 602
		Foundation	
Pg. 79, 11. 25	Pg. 80, Il. 2	Ambiguous, No	Form, 602
T 00 11 6		Foundation	
Pg. 80, 11. 6	Pg. 80, 11. 8	Ambiguous, No	Form, 602
D 07 11 04	D 07 11 07	Foundation	100 100
Pg. 95, 11. 24	Pg. 95, 11. 25	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 96, 11. 4	Pg. 96, Il. 5	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 96, Il. 10	Pg. 96, Il. 12	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 96, Il. 19	Pg. 96, 11. 20	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 97, 11. 10	Pg. 97, Il. 1	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 97, Il. 16	Pg. 97, ll. 18	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 97, 11. 21	Pg. 97, 1l. 23	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 98, 11. 3	Pg. 98, 11. 5	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 98, 11. 6	Pg. 98, 11. 9	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 98, 11. 23	Pg. 98, 11. 24	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 99, 11. 1	Pg. 99, 11. 1	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 99, 11. 6	Pg. 99, 11. 7	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 99, 11. 25	Pg. 100, Il. 3	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 100, Il. 14	Pg. 100, 11. 14	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 100, 11. 21	Pg. 100, Il. 22	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 100, 11. 24	Pg. 100, Il. 25	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 119, Il. 24	Pg. 120, 11. 25	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403, 602
Pg. 130, 11. 5	Pg. 130, 11. 6	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403, 602
Pg. 130, 11. 12	Pg. 130, 11. 14	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403, 602
Pg. 130, 11. 22	Pg. 131, 11. 1	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403, 602
Pg. 131, 11. 3	Pg. 131, ll. 6	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403, 602

Steve Storm, Volume Two:

Start	Stop	Objection	Authority
Pg. 161, Il. 24	Pg. 162, 11. 2	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 162, 11. 5	Pg. 162, ll. 8	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 162, Il. 10	Pg. 162, Il. 15	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 162, Il. 22	Pg. 162, 11. 25	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 163, 11. 12	Pg. 162, II. 13	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 170, 11. 2	Pg. 170, 11. 3	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 174, Il. 9	Pg. 174, Il. 12	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 175, ll. 2	Pg. 175, 11. 14	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 175, Il. 19	Pg. 175, II. 19	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 176, Il. 2	Pg. 176, Il. 6	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
-		Prejudicial	
Pg. 176, ll. 10	Pg. 176, 11. 11	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 177, 11. 3	Pg. 177, ll. 13	No Foundation,	402, 403
		Ambiguous	
Pg. 177, Il. 21	Pg. 178, Il. 3	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
40000		Prejudicial	
Pg. 178, ll. 14	Pg. 178, ll. 15	Lack of Foundation,	602
		No expertise	
Pg. 179, 11. 1	Pg. 179, ll. 15	Lack of Foundation,	402, 602
		No expertise	
Pg. 183, Il. 5	Pg. 183, Il. 12	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 602
7 100 11 17	7 100 11 17	Prejudicial	
Pg. 183, II. 15	Pg. 183, II. 17	Lack of Foundation,	602
		No expertise	- COA
Pg. 183, II. 20	Pg. 183, ll. 21	Lack of Foundation,	602
D 104 11 1	72 104 11 0	No expertise	(00
Pg. 184, 11. 1	Pg. 184, Il. 2	Lack of Foundation,	602
D. 104 H 5	D- 104 II 7	No expertise	(02
Pg. 184, 11. 5	Pg. 184, II. 7	Lack of Foundation,	602
Do 105 H 6	D ₀ 105 H O	No expertise	402 402 602
Pg. 185, Il. 6	Pg. 185, Il. 9	Irrelevant, Unfair, Prejudicial, Lack of	402, 403, 602
		Foundation, No	
		expertise	
Pg. 193, Il. 21	Pg. 185, Il. 23	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403, 602, 701,
1 5. 173, 11. 21	1 5. 100, 11. 20	Prejudicial, Lack of	Form
		Foundation, No	A VALLE
		expertise	
Pg. 206, 11. 2	Pg. 206, 11. 5	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403, 602, 701,
1 20. 200, 11. 2	25. 200, 11. 3	011111111111111111111111111111111111111	Form
A. 10. 14. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10			1 - 2222

Start	Stop	Objection	Authority
Pg. 206, 11. 7	Pg. 206, Il. 10	Unfair, Prejudicial	402, 403, 602, 701,
			Form
Pg. 206, 11. 12	Pg. 206, Il. 16	Unfair, Prejudicial,	Form, 403
	7 207 11 2	Hypothetical	T. 400
Pg. 207, 11. 2	Pg. 207, 11. 8	Unfair, Prejudicial,	Form, 403
72 007 11 10	D 007 II 04	Hypothetical	T 102
Pg. 207, 11. 13	Pg. 207, 11. 24	Unfair, Prejudicial,	Form, 403
D. 214 H 0	D= 207 H 10	Hypothetical Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
Pg. 214, Il. 8	Pg. 207, II. 10	Prejudicial	402, 403
Pg. 214, 11. 12	Pg. 214, Il. 18	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
1 g. 214, II. 12	1 g. 214, ii. 10	Prejudicial	102, 103
Pg. 214, 11. 20	Pg. 214, Il. 22	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
1 5. 21 1, 11. 20	5. 21 1, 11. 22	Prejudicial	,
Pg. 215, Il. 9	Pg. 215, Il. 16	Irrelevant, Unfair,	Form, 402, 403
		Prejudicial	, ,
Pg. 215, ll. 18	Pg. 216, Il. 2	Irrelevant, Unfair,	Form, 402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 216, Il. 24	Pg. 217, Il. 9	Irrelevant, Unfair,	Form, 402, 403
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 218, Il. 23	Pg. 219, II. 3	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
		Prejudicial	100 100
Pg. 219, Il. 5	Pg. 219, ll. 7	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403
D 010 11 17	D 010 11 16	Prejudicial	100 100 000 701
Pg. 219, Il. 15	Pg. 219, 11. 16	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403, 602, 701,
		Prejudicial, Lack of Foundation, No	Form
		expertise	
Pg. 219, Il. 21	Pg. 210, Il. 7	Irrelevant, Unfair,	Form, 402, 403, 802
16.217, 11.21	15.210,	Prejudicial	2 3333, 11-, 110, 111
Pg. 220, Il. 10	Pg. 220, Il. 712	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403, 602
		Prejudicial	
Pg. 220, 11. 20	Pg. 220, Il. 24	Irrelevant, Unfair,	402, 403, 802, Form
		Prejudicial,	
		Hypothetical	
Pg. 221, 11. 1	Pg. 221, Il. 13	Irrelevant, Unfair,	Form, 402, 403
		Prejudicial,	
	 	Hypothetical	100 100
Pg. 224, Il. 12	Pg. 224, Il. 117	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 224, 11. 19	Pg. 224, Il. 12	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 225, Il. 5	Pg. 225, Il. 6	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 225, Il. 12	Pg. 225, Il. 13	Irrelevant Irrelevant	402, 403 402, 403
Pg. 225, 11. 22	Pg. 225, ll. 25 Pg. 226, ll. 4	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 226, Il. 2 Pg. 226, Il. 9	Pg. 226, II. 4 Pg. 226, II. 10	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 226, II. 12	Pg. 226, Il. 10	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 226, Il. 16	Pg. 226, Il. 18	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 226, 11. 20	Pg. 226, Il. 24	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 227, ll. 8	Pg. 227, Il. 11	Irrelevant	402, 403
1 5. 221, 11. 0	1 8. 221, 11. 11	111010101111	1

Start	Stop	Objection	Authority
Pg. 227, Il. 13	Pg. 227, Il. 16	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 227, 11. 22	Pg. 227, 11. 25	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 228, 11. 3	Pg. 228, Il. 5	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 228, 11. 22	Pg. 228, 11. 23	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 229, 11. 23	Pg. 230, 1l. 2	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 238, 11. 23	Pg. 239, 11.2	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 239, Il. 13	Pg. 239, 11.17	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 239, Il. 19	Pg. 239, 11.21	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 240, Il. 2	Pg. 240, 11. 4	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 240, 11.9	Pg. 240, 11. 12	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 240, 11. 2	Pg. 240, 11.23	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 241, Il. 6	Pg. 241, Il. 6	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 241, II.10	Pg. 241, Il. 11	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 242, 11. 3	Pg. 242, 1l. 3	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 248, 11. 16	Pg. 248, ll. 18	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 249, 11. 4	Pg. 249, Il. 7	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 249, 11. 15	Pg. 249, Il. 18	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 249, 11. 21	Pg. 249, 11. 24	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 250, ll. 1	Pg. 250, 11. 3	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 250, 11. 5	Pg. 250, Il. 6	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 250, 11. 8	Pg. 250, Il. 12	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 250, ll. 16	Pg. 250, ll. 17	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 250, 11. 19	Pg. 250, Il. 21	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 250, 11. 23	Pg. 250, 11. 24	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 251, ll. 6	Pg. 251, ll. 9	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 251, ll. 10	Pg. 251, ll. 11	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 251, Il. 13	Pg. 251, Il. 14	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 251, ll. 21	Pg. 251, Il. 23	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 251, 11. 25	Pg. 252, 11. 2	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 252, Il. 5	Pg. 252, 11. 6	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 252, ll. 10	Pg. 252, Il. 12	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 252, ll. 17	Pg. 252, Il. 219	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 252, 11. 22	Pg. 252, 11. 23	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 252, 11. 25	Pg. 253, Il. 2	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 254, 11. 3	Pg. 254, 11. 4	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 254, ll. 6	Pg. 254, 1l. 6	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 254, 11. 8	Pg. 254, Il. 11	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 254, 11. 13	Pg. 254, Il. 13	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 254, Il. 15	Pg. 254, ll. 16	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 254, Il. 318	Pg. 254, Il. 320	Irrelevant	402, 403
Pg. 254, ll. 322	Pg. 254, Il. 22	Irrelevant	402, 403

THOMPSON, SCOTT 01/04/2008

Defendants' Objections

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Pg. 45, II. 16 - Pg. 46, II. 5	Lack of relevance; unfairly	FRE 402
	prejudicial	FRE 403
Pg. 101, II. 9 - 12	Lack of foundation; lack of personal knowledge; calls for speculation	FRE 602

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
Pg. 19, II. 15 - 21	Calls for legal conclusion; Calls for speculation	
Pg. 19, II. 22 - Pg. 20, II. 4	Calls for legal conclusion; calls for speculation	
Pg. 47, II. 12 - 18	Lacks foundation, no personal knowledge	FRE 602
Pg. 50, II. 6 - 13	Lacks foundation	FRE 602
Pg. 66, II. 2 - 12	Calls for legal conclusion; relevance	FRE 401-403
Pg. 66, II. 13 - 17	Calls for legal conclusion; lacks foundation; relevance	FRE 602, 401-403
Pg. 68, II. 13-18	Calls for speculation	
Pg. 77, II. 8 - Pg. 78, II. 1	Hypothetical; calls for speculation, relevance	FRE 401-403
Pg. 87, II. 15 - 24	Hypothetical; calls for speculation; relevance	FRE 401-403
Pg. 91, II. 19 - 25	Hypothetical; calls for speculation; relevance	FRE 401-403
Pg. 94, II. 2 - 18	Relevance	FRE 401-403
Pg. 102, Il. 12-18	Relevance	FRE 401-403

THOMPSON, STEPHEN -- April 7, 2009

Start	Stop	Objection	Authority
29:15	29:25	Relevance;	FRE 401
		Foundation and	FRE 701
		opinion of lay witness	
		without technical or	
		specialized knowledge	
		, calls for speculation,	
		calls for legal	
		conclusions.	
38:20	38:24	Relevance	FRE 401
39:1	39:22	Relevance	FRE 401
40:11	40:14	Calls for legal	
		conclusion	
42:2	42:5	Relevance; calls for	FRE 401, 403
		legal conclusions; lack	FRE 602
		of personal	FRE 701
		knowledge;	
		foundation; and	
		opinion of lay witness	
		without technical or	
		specialized knowledge	
42:8	42:24	Relevance; calls for	FRE 401, 403
		legal conclusions; lack	FRE 602
		of personal	FRE 701
		knowledge;	
		foundation; and	
		opinion of lay witness	
		without technical or	
		specialized knowledge	
43:20	44:1	Relevance; calls for	FRE 401
		legal conclusion	
64:10	64:18	Lack of personal	FRE 602
		knowledge; calls for	
		speculation	
65:4	65:24	Lack of personal	FRE 602
		knowledge; calls for	
		speculation	
75:15	78:5	Relevance	FRE 402, 403
78:6	78:10	Relevance; lack of	FRE 401

		personal knowledge; calls for speculation	FRE 602
78:13	79:21	Relevance	FRE 402 and 403
81:8	81:23	Relevance; lack of personal knowledge; calls for speculation	FRE 401 FRE 602
86:16	87:24	Relevance	FRE 402 and 403
93:6	93:13	Argumentative; assumes facts not in evidence; lack of personal knowledge	FRE 602
101:25	103:1	Relevance	FRE 402 and 403

Start	Stop	Objection	Authority
Pg. 48, 11. 25	Pg. 49, 11. 22	Answer is	
		nonresponsive	
Pg. 91, ll. 12	Pg. 92, Il. 1	Hearsay; lack of	FRE 602
		personal knowledge	FRE 802

THRALLS, MIKE -- March 17, 2009

Defendants' Objections

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
64:10-65:6	Lack of foundation; Subject of pending Motion in Limine regarding City of Tulsa	FRE 401, 402, 403
	Settlement	
132:6-17	Subject of pending Motion in Limine regarding City of Tulsa Settlement	
133:5-20	Subject of pending Motion in Limine regarding City of Tulsa Settlement	

Testimony Range	Objection	Authority
7:19-23	Relevance	Rule 402 and 403
9:8-17	Relevance	Rule 402 and 403
11:10-12:18	Calls for a Legal Conclusion	Rule 701
12:19-13:1	Calls for a Legal Conclusion, and Rule 602 Speculation	Rule 701
44:15-15	Calls for a Legal Conclusion	Rule 701
78:12-21	Calls for Speculation	Rule 602
79:24-82:9	Relevance, Calls for speculation, and Calls for a Legal Conclusion	Rule 402, Rule 403, Rule 602, Rule 701
87:7-20	Calls for speculation	Rule 602
97:9-17	Calls for a Legal Conclusion	Rule 701
107: 10-108:11	Calls for a Legal Conclusion	Rule 701

110:5-18	Calls for speculation and Lack of personal	Rule 602
	knowledge	
110:19-22	Relevance	Rule 401, Rule 403
121:12-23	Calls for a Legal Conclusion	Rule 701
158:21-159:2	Calls for a Legal Conclusion	Rule 701
167: 20-168:7	Relevance	Rule 402, Rule 403

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS

DEPOSITION OF GABRIEL TIMBY

NOVEMBER 12, 2007

1	Relevancy/probative	FDE 404 400
		FRE 104, 402,
V	value; Prejudicial;	403
F	Foundation/ultimate	
is	issue (use of word	
1	"waste")	
	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
v	value; Prejudicial;	403
F	Foundation/ultimate	
is	ssue (use of word	
"	'waste")	
16 7-8, 11-13, 14-15, R	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
17-19, 21, 25 v	/alue; Prejudicial;	403
1 1	Foundation (questions	
I I	eliciting testimony	
1	about entities or	
i i i	operations and their	
	activities which are not	
1 ,	ssues in the case; no	
1 1 1	oundation that these	
1	operations are in the	
1 1	RW, or that if they do,	
1 1	hat those operations	
l l	are related to the issues	
	n the case; misleading	
1 1	and confusing; waste of	
	ime)	
1 ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
1	alue; Prejudicial;	403
1 1	oundation/ultimate	
1	ssue (use of word	
, ,	'waste"; questions	
1 1	eliciting testimony	
1	bout operations which	
]	re not issues in the	
1 1	ase; no foundation that	
: : :	hese operations are in	
1 1	he IRW; misleading and	
1 1	confusing; waste of	
tî	ime)	

20	10-12, 17-19	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation/ultimate issue (use of word "waste")	FRE 104, 402, 403
21	3-5	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation/ultimate issue (use of word "waste")	FRE 104, 402, 403
22	10-12, 16-18, 20- 21	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation/ultimate issue (use of word "waste")	FRE 104, 402, 403
23	7-8	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation/ultimate issue (use of word "waste")	FRE 104, 402, 403
25	1, 24-25	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation/ultimate issue (use of word "waste")	FRE 104, 402, 403
26	16-20	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation (questions eliciting testimony about entities or operations and their activities which are not issues in the case; no foundation that these operations are in the IRW, or that if they do, that those operations are related to the issues in the case; misleading and confusing; waste of time)	FRE 104, 402, 403

			T
27	1-2, 4-5, 7-8	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation (questions eliciting testimony about entities or operations and their activities which are not issues in the case; no foundation that these operations are in the IRW, or that if they do, that those operations are related to the issues in the case; misleading and confusing; waste of	FRE 104, 402, 403
		time)	
28	16-18, 21-23, 25 6-8	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation/ultimate issue (use of word "waste"; questions eliciting testimony about operations which are not issues in the case; no foundation that these operations are in the IRW; misleading and confusing; waste of time) Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402, 403 FRE 104, 402,
		value; Prejudicial; Foundation/ultimate issue (use of word "waste")	403
28	10-11	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudice; (question about areas outside the IRW, which Magistrate has ruled is irrelevant to this case)	FRE 402, 403
28	25	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudice; Foundation (not a topic of the subpoena; question about information that is irrelevant to case; confusing)	FRE 104, 402, 403

20	1.7	Polovana/ovahativa	FRE 104, 402,
29	1-2	Relevancy/probative	403
		value; Prejudice;	405
		Foundation (not a topic	
[of the subpoena;	
		question about	
		information that is	
		irrelevant to case;	
<u></u>		confusing)	<u> </u>
30	7-14	Hearsay; Foundation	FRE 104, 402,
		(use of unauthenticated	403, 802; 6 th
		map without laying	Amend. to US
		foundation with no	Const
		ability to authenticate	
		or cross-examine	
		counsel's testimony	
		about what it is or its	
		source, all used to prove	
		truth of matter	
		asserted);	ļ:
		Relevancy/probative	
		value; Prejudice;	
		Foundation/ultimate	}
		issue (use of word	ĺ
		"waste"; assumes facts	
		not in evidence and not	1
		capable of being put	
		into evidence or cross-	
		examined; misleading;	
		confusing)	
31	1-4	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
		value; Prejudicial;	403
		Foundation/ultimate	ļ
		issue (use of word	
		"waste")	
31	9-12, 16-18	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
		value; Prejudicial;	403
		Foundation (compound;	
		vague; misleading and	
		confusing; assume facts	
		not in evidence on	İ
		issues of direction or	
		control)	
31	22-24	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
₩.T	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	value; Hearsay;	403, 802
		Foundation (calls for	TOUT OUL
		speculation by the	
		witness about what	
		George's may know)	
		George 5 may know)	<u> </u>

Page	42	ot	45
------	----	----	----

32	13-18	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
32	13-10	value; Prejudicial;	403
		Foundation/ultimate	100
i		issue (use of word	
		"waste")	
33	7-9	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
33	7-9	value; Foundation	403
		(vague and confusing	100
ĺ		` -	
n.a.		question)	FRE 104, 402,
33	14-16	Relevancy/probative	403, 702
		value (regarding	403, 702
		agronomic needs);	
		Foundation/ultimate	
		issue (Seeks expert	
		opinion —witness was	
		not qualified as an	/
		expert; assumes facts	
		not in evidence	
		regarding agronomic	
		needs and conditions in	
		the IRW)	
34	21-22	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
		value; Prejudicial;	403
		Foundation/ultimate	
		issue (use of word	
A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.		"waste")	
39	1-4	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
		value; Foundation	403
		(vague and confusing	
***************************************		question)	
41	18-22	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
		value; Prejudicial;	403
		Foundation (compound;	
		vague; misleading and	
		confusing; assume facts	
		not in evidence on	
		issues of direction or	
		control)	505 404 403
47	7-8	Relevancy/probative	FRE 104, 402,
		value; Prejudicial;	403
1		Foundation/ultimate	
		issue (use of word	
		"waste"; assumes facts	
		not in evidence	
		regarding supposed	
		difficulty in finding land	
		for use of litter)	

52	1-2	Relevancy/probative value; Hearsay; Foundation (calls for speculation by the witness about what is "possible")	FRE 104, 402, 403, 802
52	4-7, 9	Hearsay; Best evidence; Foundation (use of unauthenticated copy of soil test without laying proper foundation, to prove truth of matter asserted in the document); Relevancy/probative value; Foundation (question regarding soil test phosphorus; seeks expert opinion and witness was not qualified as an expert)	FRE 104, 402, 403, 702, 802, 1002
53	2-4	Relevancy/probative value; Hearsay; Foundation (calls for speculation by the witness; seeks expert opinion and witness was not qualified as an expert)	FRE 104, 402, 403, 702, 802
54	4-5, 13-15, 17-19	Hearsay; Best evidence; Foundation (use of unauthenticated copy of soil test without laying proper foundation, to prove truth of matter asserted in the document); Relevancy/probative value; Foundation (question regarding soil test phosphorus; seeks expert opinion and witness was not qualified as an expert)	FRE 104, 402, 403, 702, 802, 1002

55	7-8	Relevancy/probative value; Prejudicial; Foundation/ultimate	FRE 104, 402, 403
		issue (use of word	
		"waste")	